



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/978,295	10/15/2001	Avi Ashkenazi	GNE.2630PIC11	6495
35489	7590	06/16/2004	EXAMINER KEMMERER, ELIZABETH	
HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CO 94025-3506			ART UNIT 1646	
DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/978,295	Applicant(s) ASHKENAZI ET AL.	
	Examiner Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 58-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 58-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application, Amendments, And/Or Claims

The amendment and response received 29 April 2004 has been entered in full. Claims 1-57 and 63 are canceled. Claims 58-62 are under examination.

The declaration of Dr. Ashkenazi filed with the amendment and response under 37 CFR 1.132 have been received and entered into the record.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Withdrawn Objections And/Or Rejections

The objection to the specification for containing embedded hyperlinks as set forth at p. 2 of the previous Office Action (Mailed 04 February 2004) is *withdrawn* in view of the amendment received 29 April 2004.

The rejection of claims 59 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as set forth at pp. 2-3 of the previous Office Action (Mailed 04 February 2004) is *withdrawn* in view of the canceled and amended claims submitted in the amendment received 29 April 2004.

35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, First Paragraph

Claims 58-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Claims 58-62 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art would clearly not know how to use the claimed invention.

The basis for these rejections is set forth at pp. 3-6 of the previous Office Action (Mailed 04 February 2004).

Applicant's arguments submitted in the response received 29 April 2004 have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive for the following reasons. The Ashkenazi declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 29 April 2004 are insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 58-62 based upon 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, as set forth in the last Office action for the following reasons.

Applicant argues that the utility of the PRO351 nucleic acid carries over to the antibody claims. Specifically, Applicant argues that there is an assumption of utility unless a reason for one skilled in the art to question the objective truth of the statement of utility or its scope can be established. Applicant cites case law in support of this assertion. Applicant urges that a *prima facie* case of lack of utility has not been established. Applicant criticizes the examiner's reliance on Pennica et al. (of record), stating that the examiner has not established whether or not the lack of correlation between gene copy number and protein levels for WISP family members is an exception to the rule, or is the rule, and that Pennica teaches nothing conclusive regarding the absence of correlation between amplification of a gene and over-expression of the encoded protein. Applicant criticizes Pennica et al., Konopka et al.

Art Unit: 1646

and Haynes et al. for not being relevant to PRO351. Applicant asserts that the working hypothesis among those skilled in the art is that, if a gene is amplified in cancer, the encoded protein is likely to be expressed at an elevated level. This has been carefully considered but is not found to be persuasive. No evidence has been submitted that it is the norm rather than the exception that protein levels are increased when gene amplification occurs in cancer. Indeed, given the disclosure in art, such as Pennica et al., Konopka et al., and Haynes et al., that there is not always such a correlation, the skilled artisan would not assume it is so, but would perform the experiment to verify it. Therefore, the art indicates that it is not the norm that gene amplification, or even increased transcription, results in increased protein levels.

Finally, Applicant refers to the Ashkenazi declaration which asserts that if the protein levels do not increase as a result of gene amplification, it is also useful because it can serve to better diagnose the cancer. This has been fully considered but is not found to be sufficient to withdrawn the rejection, since there is no indication that the PRO351 protein levels increase or stay the same. Further research would be needed to determine PRO351 protein levels in cancers showing gene amplification of PRO351 gene. Therefore, the asserted utility is not substantial, as the real-world use has not been established. Thus, the proposed use of the PRO351 proteins (and by extension the antibodies as claimed in this application) are simply starting points for further research and investigation into potential practical uses of the proteins and antibodies. See *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), wherein the court held that:

“The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the

Art Unit: 1646

public from an invention with substantial utility”, “[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field”, and “a patent is not a hunting license”, “[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.”

Therefore, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112, first paragraph, are maintained.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

ECK

Elizabeth C. Kemmerer

ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER